## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| UNITED STATES         | )          |
|-----------------------|------------|
|                       | ) CR 12-69 |
| v.                    | ) CV 16-85 |
|                       | )          |
| JARRON DARVEZ JACKSON |            |

## MEMORANDUM ORDER

In this action, Defendant pleaded guilty to one Count of violating 18 U.S.C. 922(g)(1). On May 15, 2015, he was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of ninety-two months. The Court of Appeals affirmed his conviction and sentence. On July 25, 2017, he filed a Motion to Vacate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255, which he later supplemented. Counsel was then appointed, and asserted a claim pursuant to <u>Johnson v. United States</u>, 135 S. Ct. 2551 (2015). Via his counseled petition, Defendant abandoned the substance of his previous, <u>pro se</u> non-<u>Johnson</u> claims. For the following reasons, Defendant's Motion will be denied, and no certificate of appealability shall issue.

Defendant was sentenced based on U.S.S.G. § 2K2.1(a)(1), based on two felony convictions for "crimes of violence." His predicate convictions were for Illinois aggravated battery, 720 ILCS § 5/12-4(a), and Pennsylvania aggravated assault, 18 Pa.C.S. § 2702(a)(3). "Crime of violence" in Section 2K2.1 is defined by reference to U.S.S.G. § 4B1.2. Defendant argues that his convictions do not qualify as predicates under the applicable residual clause; he argues only that the residual clause is unconstitutionally vague under <u>Johnson</u>. Since Defendant's Motion, the Supreme Court decided <u>Beckles v. United States</u>, 137 S. Ct. 886 (2017). <u>Beckles</u> made clear that "the advisory Guidelines are not subject to vagueness challenges under

1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Judge Cercone presided over this matter until it was transferred to my docket on February 2, 2018.

the Due Process Clause." <u>Id.</u> at 890. Therefore, <u>Johnson</u> cannot form a basis for relief from Defendant's sentence, and his Motion must be denied.

According to 28 U.S.C.§ 2253(c)(2), a "certificate of appealability may issue only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." Defendant has made no such showing here, and no certificate of appealability shall issue.

AND NOW, this 10<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2018, IT IS SO ORDERED.

BY THE COURT:

Donetta W. Ambrose Senior Judge, U.S. District Court

South F. anhrase